

No. 9/5/84-Lab/6946.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Shri Munshi Ram Contractor C/o. M/s. Bharat Udyog Kassar, Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 149 of 1981

between

SHRI ARUN KUMAR SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SHRI MUNSHI RAM, CONTRACTOR C/O. M/S. BHARAT UDYOG KASSAR, BAHADURGARH, DISTRICT ROHTAK

Present :—

None for the parties

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Arun Kumar Singh and the management of M/s Shri Munshi Ram, Contractor C/O. M/s. Bharat Udyog Kassar Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak, to this Court for adjudication. —vide Labour Department Gazette, Notification No. LD/RTK/146/81/54994 dated 6th November, 1981 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Arun Kumar Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The Authorised Representative of workman appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as Labourer by the respondent on monthly wages of Rs. 292 but his services were terminated by the respondent on 30th March, 1981 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. When the respondent could not be served through registered notice, the Court passed an order on 25th February, 1982 that the dasti notice be given to the workman, who did not collect the same and the Court passed an order for registered notice to the respondent on 7th January, 1983 for 25th February, 1983. On the next date, the workman did not turn up. So, this reference was dismissed for non prosecution. The same is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated, the 31st August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 149/81/3141, dated 24th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/6949.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Leathertone Co. (India) Private Limited, Kasar, (Bahadurgarh).

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 181 of 1982

between

SHRI DEVA SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LEATHERTONE CO. (INDIA) PVT. LIMITED, KASAR (BAHADURGARH)

Present :

None for the workman.
Shri Rajiv Accountant for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Deva Singh and the management of M/s. Leathertone Co. (India) Pvt. Limited, Kasar (Bahadurgarh) to this Court for adjudication, *vide* Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/RTK/59/82/42657, dated 7th September, 1982 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Dewa Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was appointed as helper by the respondent on monthly wages of Rs 240 but his services were terminated on 27th February, 1982 in gross violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. Later on the claimant absented and before a reply could be filed by the respondent, the claim was dismissed for non prosecution. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 31st August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 131/82/3144, dated the 24th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/6950. In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of M/s Paul Engineering M, J. E Bahadurgarh (Rohtak). (I) Shri Hiran Contractor C/O. Paul Engineering MIE., Bahadurgarh District Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 13 of 1982

between

SHRI ARJUN PARSAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. PAUL ENGINEERING M.I.E., BAHADURGARH (ROHTAK), (II) SHRI HIRAMAN CONTRACTOR C/O. PAUL ENGINEERING M.I.E., BAHADURGARH, DISTRICT ROHTAK.

Present :

Shri R.S. Dahiya, A.R. for the workman.

Shri M.M. Kaushal, A.R. for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Arjun parshad and the managements of M/s. Paul Engineering MIE., Bahadurgarh (Rohtak), (II) Shri Hiran Contractor C/O. Paul Engineering MIE., Bahadurgarh, district, Rohtak, to this Court, for adjudication, *vide* Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/RTK/174/81/2169 dated 12th January, 1982:

Whether the termination of service of Shri Arjun Parshad was justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as painter by the respondent on monthly wages of Rs. 173- and later on the management terminated his services without any unlawful excuse and in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A detailed reply was filed by the respondent, controverting the various pleas taken by the workman. I need not discuss the same, because this reference is being answered on grounds other than merits.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision on 30th August, 1982:—

1. Whether there existed relationship of master and servant between the parties?

2. Whether the applicant has remained gainfully employed in some other organisation?

3. Whether the termination of service of Shri Arjun Parshad was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

5. Before any evidence could be adduced, the workman absented, so, this reference was ordered to be dismissed for non prosecution. The same is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 31st August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endstt. No. 13/82/3145 dated the 24th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84 Lab/6986.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Greiner Engineering Products, 13/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 38 of 1984

between

SHRI LAXMAN RAI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF
M/S GREINER ENGINEERING PRODUCTS, 13/7, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :—

None, for the parties.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/PD/182-83/957P-76, dated 6th March, 1984 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the Industrial Dispute existing between Shri Laxman Rai, workman and the respondent management of M/s. Greiner Engineering Products, 13/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Laxman Rai, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The case was called many a times. It is 2.00 p. m. It shows that the workman is not interested in the reference. Hence the award is given that no dispute is pending between the parties.

R. N. SINGAL,

Dated the 18th September 1984.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2183, dated 26th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/6987.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Greiner Engineering, Products, 13/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 39 of 1984

between

SHRI FAQUIR MOHD WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF
M/S GREINER ENGINEERING PRODUCTS, 13/7, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:—None for the parties.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/182-83/9564—69, dated 6th March, 1984, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the industrial dispute existing between Shri Faquir Mohd. workman and the respondent management of M/s. Greiner Engineering, Products 13/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Faquir Mohd, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The case was called many a times. It is 2.00 p.m. It shows that the workman is not interested in the reference. Hence the award is given that no dispute is pending between the parties.

The 18th September, 1984

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Faridabad.

Endst No. 2184 dated the 26th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.